



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

To many, doubtless, the author will seem to have gone to an opposite extreme as far from the true mean as the position of the most bigoted cell theorist. But the evidence is continually increasing that the substance, rather than the cell furnishes us the true standpoint from which to study and explain the facts of anatomy and physiology. It is gradually becoming clear that cells are only subordinate, and by no means ultimate, fundamental, or comparatively independent, centres in one mass of substance, controlled by the organism as a whole. The theory of the organism which makes it a mere multitude of co-operating cells, like that theory of state-rights which makes of our nation a mere confederation of states, is liable to lead to very unsafe deductions. We must continue to speak of cells with their different powers and structures, but we must remember that cell-structure is only an areal differentiation in one mass of substance, and that its powers are delegated by the organism. One substance, characterised by sensibility, irritability, or by whatever name we may choose to call it, continuous through the organism, and passing in the reproductive elements from generation to generation through all the chain of life in time past and present, ever changing and yet persisting, resistant and yet indefinitely adaptable;—such a substance would seem to furnish the basis for all vital phenomena.

But what becomes of our search for the vital, morphological units? We can hardly think, much less argue, concerning protoplasm without postulating something of the kind. We talk learnedly of physiological units and pangens, of plastidule and biophore. But we know only substance. But is there one fundamental substance, protean in its functions? Certainly protoplasm seems to be a mixture of various chemical compounds. Still all these substances may be merely more definite areal differentiations of one primitive protoplasm. Even if we could arrive at one primitive, homogeneous, living substance, would the real difficulties in the way of an understanding of its functions and powers be lessened? We cannot see that they would. The correlation between structures and actions of different parts of a homogeneous substance would seem less rather than more conceivable. This is the great enigma of life; the "fitsomeness" of the substance, the conformity of it to its inclusions and the molding of them to it, the fitting of its parts to one another and of itself to its environment. And from the solution of this enigma we seem as far removed as ever.

JOHN M. TYLER.

THE CHANCES OF DEATH AND OTHER STUDIES IN EVOLUTION. By *Karl Pearson*, M. A., F. R. S. With Illustrations. In Two Volumes. London and New York: Edward Arnold, Publisher.

The title of this book renders the first essay more prominent than the rest of the articles, and is apt to give a wrong impression to the book-buyer who glances over the pages of a catalogue. The book consists of a collection of essays on most various topics—the Roulette of Monte Carlo; Reproductive Selection and Its Chances; Woman and Labor; Woman as a Witch; the Passion Play, a Study of

the Evolution of Western Christianity, etc., but all are treated from the same point of view which replaces the colored spectacles through which the *Märchen* looks at the world by the exact figures of a scientific conception of facts, and thus Karl Pearson sheds much light on our old traditions, inherited opinions, and institutions. In order to characterise the treatment which all these questions receive at the hand of our author, we sketch here his exposition of the *Märchen* as a witness of an old civilisation which preceded Christianity and may have prevailed in Germany in the age when Tacitus wrote or even previous to it. Professor Pearson says:

"Ashiepatle, the dirty ash-lad, Hans 'der Dummling,' a 'Schneiderlein,' or 'the miller's boy, sets out into the world to seek his luck. He is courteous and friendly to an old woman whom he meets in the forest, and who possesses magical powers. He travels through many kingdoms, and at last he comes to one where the king is in difficulties from dragons or giants, or in domestic trouble owing to his daughter declining matrimony until a wooer is found who can perform certain notable feats. Hans, with the aid of the aforesaid old woman, either achieves prodigious victories, or accomplishes all the tasks proposed to him. He then demands his bride; he marries the princess and becomes heir to the throne."

In the *Märchenland* "kings were as plenty as blackberries," and "the great bulk of the population we have to deal with leads a country life. We may be taken into a village, but rarely, if ever, into a town. We have to deal with peasants and with hunters, with men and women of the fields and of the forests. We are introduced to goose-girls, to swineherds, to women who spend their time amid cows and goats, and men who chop wood and hunt. If the craftsman comes in, it is the craftsman of the village community, the blacksmith, the tailor, or the miller. If we go into towns and palaces, it is the simpleton and country lad who takes us there; we do not deal with ships and merchandise, but with agricultural produce and the trophies of the chase. Cathedrals and knights and men in armor are not of our company. If we want advice or sympathy we seek it not of priests or lawyers, of bailies or *Amtmänner*; we go to the animals, to a *weise Frau* or a *Hexe*. With the exception of kings, to be referred to later, the *Schultheiss*, or elected head of a peasant community, is almost the chief authority we come across. In short, the people who developed the Teutonic *Märchen*, as we know it in our Grimm, were not a town population, but one living by agriculture and hunting; not a people of the mountains, the snows, and the lakes, but a people living rather in the clearings of the forest; a people with a primitive agriculture, chiefly conducted by women; a people to whom the witch and wise woman, rather than the priest and knight, were the guides and instructors in life. The *Märchen* have been added to, developed, modified; all sorts of later elements and personages have been grafted on to them, but, taken in the bulk, we see quite clearly that they are *not the production of an age which knew Christianity and chivalry*."

The civilisation of the *Märchen* is the period of matriarchy. The man marries into the wife's family; the mother goddess is still of great influence; the *Hexe* is by no means the ugly hag of the Middle Ages, but rather the wise woman, the queen. To conquer a kingdom in those days one had simply to kill the king and marry the queen, or if it was done in a more peaceful way, one married the daughter of a king. In the Norse tale *De syv Folerne* the king says to Ashlad, his son-in-law:

"You have got half the kingdom, and the other half you shall have on my death; for my sons can win land and kingdoms for themselves, now they are again princes."

Professor Pearson asks:

"And what became of *Märchenland*? It faded away before a world of grammar, history, and geography, a hundred times more idle and unreal than itself."

Our author concludes his study with these words:

"As we read fairy stories to our children, we may study history ourselves. No longer oppressed with the unreal and the *baroque*, we may see primitive human customs, and the life of primitive man and woman, cropping out in almost every sentence of the nursery tale. Written history tells us little of these things, they must be learnt, so to speak, from the mouths of babes. But there they are in the *Märchen* as invaluable fossils for those who will stoop to pick them up and study them. Back in the far past we can build up the life of our ancestry—the little kingdoms, the queen or her daughter as king-maker, the simple life of the royal household, and the humble candidate for the kingship, the priestess with her control of the weather, and her power over youth and maid. In the dimmest distance we see traces of the earlier kindred group-marriage, and in the nearer foreground the beginnings of that fight with patriarchal institutions which led the priestess to be branded by the new Christian civilisation as the evil-working witch of the Middle Ages. All this and something more may be learnt by the elder, while little eyes sparkle and little cheeks grow warm over the success which attends kindly, simple Ashiepatle in the search for his luck." κ.

BUDDHISM AND ITS CHRISTIAN CRITICS. By *Dr. Paul Carus*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. 1897. Pages, 316. Price, \$1.25.

The main difficulty, perhaps, about Buddhism is the apparent contradiction involved in its teaching that there is no soul and yet preaching morals, the purification of the soul, and its immortality. Almost all criticisms of Buddhism either denounce the system as inconsistent, or condemn it as atheism and nihilism. It is these problems which all who study Buddhism will encounter, and almost all who have failed to grasp its significance have stumbled here. The fact is that Buddhism is a religion which possesses a definite philosophy, and its main problem centres in psychology. All the other religions are different in this respect. They are exclusively practical, and committed to no special philosophy. Their founders used cer-